

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,944,794 (Okomoto et al.). The Okomoto reference is directed to a user identification data management scheme for a networking computer system using a wide area network. Each computer is judged as to whether an access request from a user at another computer is permitted. Access permission data is checked and is necessary to determine whether a communication to each computer is from one user at one computer from which an access to each computer by that one user is permitted. The access permission data that is generated is then stored in memory. Then, whether an access to each computer is directly made at each computer or indirectly made from another computer through a network is detected. Hence, the Okomoto reference is directed to, among other things, allowing remote access to a computer, such as a home computer or other computer, from another remote computer and having access to the resources available on another computer from the remote computer. Okomoto is not directed to, nor does it teach among other things, a first unit, an intermediate unit, and an authentication unit that utilizes secondary channels for communicating authentication codes in the manner claimed by Applicants. In fact, it appears that Okomoto is directed to a completely different system.

As to claim 1, for example, the claim requires, among other things, sending, by a first unit, user identification data to an authentication unit, determining which intermediate destination unit will receive an authentication code, sending the authentication code to the intermediate destination unit based on the user ID data via a first secondary channel, and retransmitting by the intermediate destination unit, the authentication code to the first unit via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to the user. Although there are various portions of the cited reference identified in the office action, Applicants are unable to find support for the claim terms and as such, if the rejection is maintained, Applicants

respectfully request a showing as to which specific elements in Okomoto correspond to the claimed “first unit”, “authentication unit”, “intermediate destination unit” that receives “an authentication code”, “the first secondary channel” and “second secondary channel” and the other operations carried out by the respective units.

For example, the office action cites column 20, lines 20-28 and column 21, lines 19-45 as allegedly teaching the claimed retransmitting by an intermediate destination unit, the authentication code to the first unit via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to the user. However, this cited portion from Okomoto actually refers to the temporary password that is issued, for example, by a home unit for a user that is at a remote unit that is attempting to access the home unit. Applicants are unable to find which element is the claimed “authentication unit” and the claimed “intermediate destination unit” wherein the intermediate destination unit retransmits the authentication code to the first unit via the second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to the user. There does not appear to be any discussion of a first or second secondary channel as claimed or the intermediate units and retransmission of the authentication code. The cited portion of column 21, lines 19-45 does not teach retransmitting, by an intermediate destination unit, the authentication code back to the first unit via a second secondary channel wherein the first unit sent the user ID to the authentication unit.

For example, the cited portion appears to merely state that a remote system may access the file system of a target computer system (home system 2) such as in an example where a user uses a remote file transfer program in order to make a copy of a file remotely from a home system. (See for example, column 21, lines 9-14). The remote file transfer program sets up a communication path with the target computer system and a request is sent to the target computer system. The target system then allows the activation of the remote file transfer of the home system. There is no discussion of transmitting and retransmitting

“authentication codes” via secondary channels as claimed nor the use of an intermediate destination unit that does this retransmitting as claimed. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Other elements in claim 1 are also missing from the cited reference, such as receiving the retransmitted authentication code from the intermediate destination unit and returning an authentication code back to the authentication unit. This occurs after sending the authentication unit to the intermediate destination unit as required, for example, in claim 1. This sending, retransmitting and returning of the authentication code via the various units as claimed is not taught or suggested by the cited reference. For example, Applicants note in their specification, the first unit may be, for example, a mobile device and the third unit may be a pager or cell phone that the user has. An authentication unit will use primary authentication information that was sent by the first unit to determine which device to send the generated authentication code to. For example, where the user has a pager as a third unit, the authentication code is sent to the third unit. The intermediate unit then retransmits the authentication code via a secondary channel, such as a short range wireless channel back, to the first unit. The first unit, then transparent to the user, resends the retransmitted authentication code back to the authentication unit via the primary channel used to originally send the primary authentication information during the same session. (See for example, specification page 6). Such an authentication code communication scheme and operation is not taught or suggested by the cited reference.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. By way of example, claim 4 requires that the second secondary channel is a short range channel that includes notifying, by the second unit, the first unit of a short range secondary channel used to receive the retransmitted authentication code from the third unit. The office action cites column 21, lines 19-22. As claimed, the second secondary channel is the channel used by the

intermediate destination unit to retransmit the authentication code to the first unit. In the cited section, there only appears to be a remote system and a home system and not an intermediate destination unit nor a first unit nor an authentication unit as required by the claims. Moreover, Applicants are unable to find any mention of any short range secondary channel that receives a retransmitted authentication code in the cited portion, as the cited portion refers to a file transfer program that sets up a communication path between a target and remote system. Accordingly, the reference appears to be silent as to the claimed subject matter and as such the claims are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 6, the office action cites column 20, lines 20-28 and column 21, lines 19-45 as allegedly teaching a user authentication scheme that includes utilizing an intermediate unit that receives from an authentication unit, via a first secondary channel, an authentication code for a first unit. However, as Applicants noted above, there does not appear to be three units communicating as required by the claim. For example, the cited portion in column 20 refers to data stored, for example, at the home system or remote system. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing as to which element in the cited reference corresponds to Applicants' claimed "first unit", Applicants' claimed "intermediate unit", Applicants' claimed "authentication unit", the "first secondary channel" and the "authentication code".

In addition, the office action cites column 28, lines 8-14 as allegedly teaching retransmitting the intermediate destination unit, the authentication code back to the first unit via a second secondary channel in a way that is transparent to a user of the first unit. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion in column 28 again refers to the remote file transfer program used with the home system by a remote system. This portion is silent as to any intermediate destination unit, any retransmitting of the authentication code back to the first unit wherein the authentication code is received by the intermediate unit, and using a

second secondary channel. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim.

As to claim 8, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is believed to be in condition for allowance.

As to claim 9, this claim adds additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and is also allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim.

As to claim 10, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims also add novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 13, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made with respect to claim 1 and also note that the claim requires, among other things, the use of a wireless back channel and a wireless primary channel to communicate the authentication information and/or authentication code among the various units as claimed. The office action cites column 18, lines 57-58 and column 20, lines 30-34. However, these portions are silent as the claimed subject matter. For example, lines 57-58 are silent as to any wireless primary channel and instead refer to structure that are optional since they are omitted by dashed lines. In addition, the cite to column 20 also fails to mention a wireless primary channel that is used by the second unit and first unit as claimed. Accordingly, this claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.


Claim 16 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Claim 17 is believed to be allowable as adding additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and also as being allowable based on an allowable base claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 13, 2005

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005